

Replying to the restriction requirement Office Action mailed May 6, 2002, applicants hereby provisionally and respectfully elect Group I, presently comprising claims 1-17, 21-40, 73 and 74, directed to the device, without prejudice and without traverse.

Applicants accept the PTO ruling that the inventions are patentably distinct from one another, i.e. each is patentable over the other. The non-elected claims have now been deleted without prejudice to applicants' rights including those rights provided by Sections 120 and 121, to pursue the non-elected invention in a divisional application without any loss of rights and without any penalty whatsoever.

In addition to the restriction requirement, the PTO has also imposed an election of species requirement.

As applicants are required to make an election, even though the requirement is traversed, applicants hereby provisionally and respectfully elect Species 9, without prejudice, and with traverse. However, such traversal is not at this time based on the absence of patentable distinctness, regarding which applicants make no comment either way at this time. Instead, applicants traverse on the basis of the second paragraph of MPEP 803, as applicants submit it would not constitute a serious burden to examine plural species.


The claims which read on the elected Species 9  
(Figs. 19 and 20) are claims 14-17, 21-23, 28, 30 and 37-40.

Applicants respectfully await the results of a first  
examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By

  
Roger L. Browdy  
Registration No. 25,618

SN:RLB:jec:rd  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\A\Awap\Solem3A\pto\AmendmentB.doc